

**IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE
THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of	Appeal No.
Lauri LOVEN et al.	Conf. 8635
Application No. 10/529,243	Group 2165
Filed March 25, 2005	Examiner K. Buckingham

A METHOD OF AND A SYSTEM FOR ERROR CORRECTION OF SERVICE REQUESTS
IN AN INFORMATION SYSTEM

REPLY BRIEF

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONORS:

At the outset, Appellants maintain all of the positions taken throughout prosecution and most recently in the brief filed June 15, 2009. Appellants will, in the present Reply Brief, address those points that have been directly raised in the Examiner's Answer and to which a response is demanded to present a clear picture for the Board.

The Examiner's Answer on page 12, Response to Argument, fundamentally alters the manner in which the Sugikawa reference is relied upon, in an apparent attempt to rehabilitate the rejections on appeal; however, the rejections as thus reformulated are no more sustainable than those applied in the final rejection.

More specifically, the Examiner now argues that col. 12 lines 16 - 29 of Sugikawa et al. discloses "forwarding said

service request to a service source identified in said analysis," as in claim 8.

In this connection it should be observed that this feature (or actually features) is defined in independent claim 8 as: "analyzing said service request at said access point in order to identify a predetermined keyword indicating a service source offering the requested service, forwarding said service request to a service source identified in said analysis."

It is in other words the access point having received the service request that carries out the analyzing and forwarding to a service source once such a source has been identified. This is not the case in cited portion of Sugikawa to which the Examiner refers.

On col. 12 line 12 it is indicated that the part of Sugikawa to which the Examiner refers to data processing devices B, C, D and E. These processing devices are, however, not comparable with the claimed access point (which according to the claim carries out the analyzing), but instead with the claimed service source which receives the service request after analyzing. This is clear based on col. 11 lines 44 to 47 where it is explained that it is device A that originally receives the service request; col. 12 lines 5 to 6, where it is explained that device A forwards the service request to "all the devices on the network", consequently B, C, D and E; and col. 12 lines 13 to 15 where it is explained that devices B, C, D and E receives the

data.

In addition, as cited part of Sugikawa fails to teach or suggest that devices B, C, D or E having received the data would after an analysis forward the data to a service source identified in the analysis. Instead the controller unit of these devices only determines if they by themselves can provide the service (col. 12 lines 27 - 29).

Accordingly, reversal of the rejections set forth by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Attorney for Appellants
Registration No. 55,394
209 Madison St., Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703)521-2297

November 23, 2009

JJL/fb